



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 4, 1909

NO. 8

In the August number of *The Atlantic Monthly* is a short novel, entitled *Cecily*, by William J. Hopkins. In the second chapter there occurs the following paragraph:

I have had all my time planned out for some while. It will be pretty thoroughly occupied with teaching my son and seeing that he has enough Latin and Greek. Now that these studies have gone out of fashion with the colleges, there is nobody to see that a boy gets enough of them unless his father sees to it. There is nothing to take their place; nothing else that will do, for a boy, just what they did. Modern methods! I snap my fingers at modern methods. I have seen enough of the results of so-called modern methods in my own teaching. There are no results.

It is interesting to have the value of the Classics emphasized thus casually where the appreciation will reach a large number of readers. It is also interesting to have the futility of modern methods so strongly stressed. It occurs to me to wonder whether the term 'modern methods' may not also have been intended to apply to the Classics. For surely during the last twenty years there has been a great deal said about modern methods and I wonder whether other non-teachers could say the same thing with regard to the modern methods of teaching Latin. For is not this period the period of beginners' books in which enough grammar is included to render the use of a grammar in addition unnecessary? And is not this the period when every means is emphasized to stimulate interest, this interest being according to the idea of the teacher rather than of the pupil? And is not this the period during which the reading of the secondary schools has been restricted more and more closely to a few set books? And is this not the period when the examination in prose composition based on a passage in the author read has had the greatest vogue? It seems to me that all of these—you may not call them methods, but certainly devices—would go under the name of 'modern methods'.

And have there really been no results? It is a question upon which people are not agreed and yet the tendency of criticism as exemplified in the remarks of college officers charged with the administration of studies in recent years has been distinctly in the negative and the reports of the College Entrance Examination Board seem to imply the same. In the report of last year, for example, the statis-

tics indicate that the least favorable showing was made in Latin.

The report also says, "About four-fifths of the candidates failed to receive 60 per cent in elementary prose composition and advanced prose composition. About three-fifths of the candidates failed to receive 60 per cent in Caesar, Cicero, and sight translation".

The fact that the difference between the results in prose composition and Caesar, Cicero and sight translation is only one-fifth is an indication that *relatively* better work is done in the more difficult subject, prose composition, than in the other; consequently such criticism cannot be directed towards the vagaries of any one paper. The percentage of candidates obtaining a rating between 90 and 100 and 75 and 89 per cent is so instructive that I have subjoined it.

		% ratings 90-100	% ratings 75-89	% ratings 60-74
Latin a.	i. Grammar	0.9	11.3	42.4
	ii. Elementary Prose Composition	0.5	5.0	16.8
	b. Caesar	1.3	11.2	28.4
	c. Cicero	0.7	9.0	26.3
	d. Vergil, Aeneid I-VI..	2.5	16.4	36.5
	e. Nepos	0.0	0.0	0.0
	be. Caesar and Nepos....	2.0	20.0	36.0
	f. Sallust	0.0	0.0	14.3
	g. Ovid	0.0	0.0	21.4
	l. Prose Composition....	0.1	3.4	16.2
	m. Elementary Sight Translation of Prose	1.0	10.0	28.9
	p. Advanced Sight Trans- lation of Prose....	0.0	7.9	39.7
	q. Sight Translation of Poetry	0.9	4.5	35.5
	dq. Aeneid I-VI and Sight	0.0	5.5	38.2

Surely these results from our methods after four years of instruction are not encouraging. Is the fault with the methods, is the fault with the examinations, is the fault with the requirements? Personally I feel that the fault lies primarily with the requirements, next with the methods, and least of all with the examinations. These are always set with a view to laying stress upon knowledge of essentials and of the work covered. They could hardly be easier to be examinations at all and the scrutiny that they have to pass from the Board of Review makes it clear that they are not regarded as

unfair. That between 1,000 and 1,200 students should study Latin grammar, elementary prose composition, Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil for the time required in the secondary schools and make as poor a showing on examinations which have been carefully scrutinized makes the question of decision an easy one. The fault lies in the combination of methods and requirements or it lies in the organization of the schools and in the feeling which prompts numerous parents to have their children study Latin when they are mentally unqualified for it.

The thoughts evoked by Mr. Hopkins's paragraph are the more insistent because in the same number of *The Atlantic Monthly* is an article by Dr. Edmiston on Classical Education in America in which he excoriates the aims and methods pursued here, holding up as a terrible example his own experience. It would be too mild to say that he has no words of commendation for our system. He has really no words strong enough to characterize what he regards as its utter futility. He expressly declines to suggest any definite measures of relief, which is a pity because in the multitude of suggestions there lies the possibility of a solution.

Meanwhile, however, it would be well for classical teachers everywhere to ponder the results of the College Board examinations. Such results are not new in their experiences, but their publication may stimulate them to action. G. L.

Vergil's Debt

to the

Hecuba and Troades of Euripides.

(Concluded from Page 52)

The cry of Aeneas (1.94-99)

O terque quarterque beati,
quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis
contigit opetere!

saevus ubi Aeacidæ telo iacet Hector

is the thought of Cassandra (Troades 386-389)

Τρῶες δὲ πρῶτον μὲν, τὸ κάλλιστον κλέος,
ὑπὲρ πάτρας ἔθνησκον· οὓς δ' ἔλοι δόρυ,
νεκροί γ' ἐξ οἴκου φερόμενοι φίλων ὕπο
ἐν γῇ πατρώα περιβολὰς εἶχον χθονός.

A choral ode of the Troades tells of the fatal horse and furnishes Vergil with more material for Aeneas's story. It begins with an invocation like Musa, mihi causas memora (Aen. 1.8), thus. (see Troades 511-514):

ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, ὦ
Μοῦσα, καινῶν ὕμνων
ἄεισον ἐν δακρύοις ᾠδὰν ἐπικηδεῖον.

Then follow Troades 519-521:

ἔλιπον ἵππον οὐράνια
βρέμοντα χρυσεοφάλαρον ἔνο—
πλον ἐν πύλαις Ἀχαιοί.

These verses are reproduced in Aen. 2.15, 20:

instar montis equum
uterumque armato milite complent.

A certain thought occurred to the Trojans of the Troades and to those of the Aeneid; compare Troades 524-526

Ἴτ', ὦ πεπανμένοι πόνων,
τόδ' ἱερὸν ἀνάγετε ξόανον
Ἰλιάδι Διογενεὶ Κόρα.

with Aen. 2.32,33

primusque Thymoetes
duci intra muros hortatur et arce locari.

In the play, as in the Aeneid, they prepared a joyful reception for the image; compare Troades 527-532, 537-541, 545-550

τίς οὐκ ἔβα νεανίδων,
τίς οὐ γεραῖος ἐκ δόμων ;
κεχαρμένοι δ' αἰοδαῖς
δόλιον ἔσχον ἄταν
πᾶσα δὲ γένηα Φρυγῶν
πρὸς πύλας ὤρμαθη.

κλωστοῦ δ' ἀμφιβόλοις λίνου ναὸς ὥσεί
σκάφος κελαιόν, εἰς ἔδρανα
λαῖνα δάπεδά τε φόνια πατρί—
δι Παλλάδος θέσαν θεᾶς.

παρθένου δ'
ἀέριον ἀνὰ κρότον ποδῶν
βοὰν ἔμελλον εὐφρον', ἐν
δόμοις δὲ παμφαῖς σέλας
πυρὸς μέλαιναν αἴγλαν
ἄκος ἔδωκεν ἦπνψ

with Aen. 2.235-237, 238-240, 245, 252-253:

Accingunt omnes operi, pedibusque rotarum
subiciunt lapsus, et stuppea vincula collo
intendunt.

Pueri circum innuptaeque puellae
sacra canunt, funemque manu contingere
gaudent.

Illa subit, mediaeque minans inlabitur urbi.

Et monstrum infelix sacra sistimus arce.

fusi per moenia Teucri
conticuere, sopor fessos complectitur artus:

In Troades 581, Andromache says πρὶν ποτ' ἦμεν ; in 1292 the chorus exclaims οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔστι Τροία and so in 2.325 Aeneas cries, fuit Ilium.

As one of the chief incidents of the Hecuba is the fate of Polyxena, so the Troades is concerned with the fates of Andromache, Astyanax and Cassandra. The wife of Hector tells her story (Troades 658-660):

ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡρέθην
Ἀχιλλέως με παῖς ἐβουλήθη λαβεῖν
δάμαρτα δουλεύσῃ δ' ἐν αὐθεντῶν δόμοις.